

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, claims 6-8, 11, 13 and 14 have been cancelled, while the claims have been amended for clarity.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,774,926 to Ellis et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,163,316 to Killian.

The Ellis patent discloses a personal television channel system, in which a communications network (the Internet) supplies a plurality of programs to various receiving devices (36, 38).

The Killian patent discloses an electronic programming system and method, in which audio/video overlays 32 integrates a received television program from tuner/decoder 24 with associated information received via the Internet and VBI information into a single image for viewing on a television 40.

The subject invention relates to the receiving of a plurality of programs and the selection of one of the programs to be reproduced. In particular, as claimed in claim 1, a controller causes a plurality of program receiving devices to tune to respective ones of the plurality of programs, while a user interface enables a user to select one of the respective ones of the plurality of programs while the controller controls a switch to couple the output from the program receiving device tuned to the selected program, to an input of a reproduction device.

As indicated in MPEP § 2143.03, "To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970)."

Applicant submits that the prior art neither shows nor suggests "a controller operatively coupled to each of said plurality of program receiving devices, said controller controlling said plurality of program receiving devices to tune to respective ones of said plurality of programs" and "a user interface coupled to said controller for inputting a users desire for a selected program of said respective ones of said plurality of programs". As such, Applicant believes that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, and as such, the rejection should fall.

Applicant believes that the subject invention, as claimed, is not rendered obvious by the prior art, either individually or collectively, and as such, is patentable thereover.

Applicant believes that this application, containing claims 1-5, 9, 10, 12 and 15-20, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by /Edward W. Goodman/
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613
Attorney
Tel.: 914-333-9611